

Reply to Office Action of January 18, 2005  
Amendment Dated: March 24, 2005

Appl. No.: 10/727,252  
Attorney Docket No.: H0005762

### REMARKS

Claims 1-19 were examined in the outstanding office action mailed on January 18, 2005 (hereafter "Outstanding Office Action"). Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 14 and 18 were objected to because of informalities, claims 7, 13, 16, 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph, claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 14, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and claims 2-3, 6-7, 9-13, 15-17 and 19 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowable subject matter.

By virtue of this amendment, claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 11, 13, 17 and 18 are sought to be amended, and claims 6, 10, 16 and 19 are sought to be canceled. The amendments and cancellations are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-15 and 17-18 are thus presented for consideration, further in view of the following remarks.

#### *Associate Power of Attorney*

First, it is noted that an Associate Power of Attorney, appointing the undersigned representative to prosecute the subject application, is enclosed. See MPEP § 402.02 for additional details.

#### *Information disclosure statement (IDS)*

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering and making of record the IDS mailed on 12/04/2003, and for sending a duly initialed copy of the corresponding 1449 form in the Outstanding Office Action.

#### *Claim Objections*

Claims 1, 8, 14 and 18 were objected to with the suggestion to substitute "manages"

Reply to Office Action of January 18, 2005  
Amendment Dated: March 24, 2005

Appl. No.: 10/727,252  
Attorney Docket No.: H0005762

for "can manage". The subject claims are sought to be accordingly amended. Applicants thank the Examiner for the detailed examination and the suggestion. Withdrawal of the objection with respect to claims 1, 8, 14 and 18 is respectfully requested.

5 Similarly, it was suggested that claim 2 be amended to remove the second occurrence of "to said" in line 7. Claim 2 is accordingly sought to be amended, and withdrawal of the objection with respect to claim 2 is respectfully requested.

10 The term "another command" of claim 6 also has been objected to noting that there was not a first command transferred, but is believed to be moot in view of the cancellation of claim 6. However, Applicants take this opportunity to note that the labels "first", "second", "another", etc., have been chosen merely to enable backward reference (for clear antecedent basis), and have no significance in terms of order, precedence, etc.

Nevertheless, it is respectfully pointed out that the amendments to claim 1 incorporating at least some of the features of allowable claim 6, are in line with the Examiner's suggestions with respect to claim 6.

15 ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112***

20 Claims 7, 13 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, with the contention that there are omitted elements which would indicate how the use of the wireless connection enables FDMS to easily maintain a central log. In response, the three claims are sought to be amended to remove the phrase/clause which substantially recites that the use enables FDMS to easily maintain a central log. Withdrawal of the rejection with respect to claims 7, 13 and 17 is respectfully requested.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements. The rejection is rendered moot in view of the cancellation of claim 19. However, it is noted that the features of claim 19, indicated to

Reply to Office Action of January 18, 2005  
Amendment Dated: March 24, 2005

Appl. No.: 10/727,252  
Attorney Docket No.: H0005762

contain allowable subject matter, have been substantially included in amended claim 18. For efficiency of prosecution, applicants explain the objection with respect to amended claim 18, which recites in relevant parts:

5                   ...  
                  wherein said client is connected to a second field device *by a path*,  
                  sending a second command to said FDMS *on said wireless medium*, said  
                  second command being directed to a second field device contained in said plurality  
                  of field devices;  
                  receiving said second command from said FDMS *on said wireless medium*;  
10                  and  
                  forwarding said second command to said second field device *on said path*  
                  after said receiving from said FDMS.  
                  (Portion of Amended Claim 19, *Emphasis Added*)

15                  Merely to assist the Examiner, applicants read the above portion of amended claim  
19 on the example embodiment of Figure 3. The path corresponds to path 381 and wireless  
medium is between antennas 155 and 185. Thus, client 180 sends a second command to  
the FDMS on the wireless medium, receives the second command from the FDMS on the  
wireless medium from the FDMS, and forwards the same to field device 110-Z on path  
381.

20                  Claim 16 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, noting that  
there is no sufficient antecedent basis in "from said third client". The rejection is rendered  
moot since claim 16 is sought to be canceled. However, it is noted that the amendments to  
claim 14, which incorporate substantially the features of claim 16, recite "from a third  
client".

25                  Accordingly, all the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 are believed to be overcome  
and/or addressed.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

Applicants again thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 2-3, 6-7, 9-13, 15-  
17 and 19 are allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations

Reply to Office Action of January 18, 2005  
Amendment Dated: March 24, 2005

Appl. No.: 10/727,252  
Attorney Docket No.: H0005762

of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants now explain how the presented claims are all allowable in view of the indicated allowable subject matter.

Amended independent claim 1 is allowable over the art of record, at least as incorporating substantially the features of canceled claim 6, which has been indicated to contain allowable subject matter, as explained now. Canceled claim 6 recited in part as follows:

The method of claim 1, further comprising a second client connected to said FDMS by a wire-based medium, said method further comprising:  
transferring another command from said second client to said FDMS on said wire-based medium, said another command being directed to a second device contained in said plurality of field devices; and  
forwarding said another command from said FDMS to said second field device,  
whereby commands from clients connected by both wire-based and wireless mediums are channeled through said FDMS.  
(Canceled claim 6)

It is noted that currently amended claim 1 substantially contains the features of canceled claim 6 as noted below, and is allowable over the art of record since claim 6 has been indicated to contain allowable subject matter.

...  
*providing a wireless connection from a first client, wherein said wireless connection provides communication between said first client and said FDMS;*  
*enabling said operator to issue a first command from said first client to a first field device contained in said plurality of field devices;*  
*transferring said first command from said first client to said FDMS on said wireless connection;*  
*forwarding said first command from said FDMS to said first field device on said control network,*  
*whereby said operator can manages said plurality of field devices using said first client;*  
*providing a wire-based connection between a second client and said FDMS;*  
*transferring another command from said second client to said FDMS on said wire-based medium, said another command being directed to a second device contained in said plurality of field devices; and*  
*forwarding said another command from said FDMS to said second field*

Reply to Office Action of January 18, 2005  
Amendment Dated: March 24, 2005

Appl. No.: 10/727,252  
Attorney Docket No.: H0005762

*device,*  
*whereby commands from said first client and said second client are*  
*channeled through said FDMS.*  
*(Currently Amended Independent Claim 1, Emphasis Added)*

5 Independent claims 8 and 14 are also sought to be amended similar to independent claim 1, and are believed to be allowable over the art of record at least for reasons noted above with respect to amended claim 1.

Independent claim 18 is sought to be amended to include at least substantially the features of canceled claim 19, which has been indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent claim format. Accordingly, amended independent claim 18 is also allowable  
10 over the art of record.

Since all the presented independent claims, at least as amended, are allowable over the art of record, the dependent claims are also allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

15 *Conclusion*

Thus, all the objections and rejections are believed to be overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance over the art of record. The Examiner is invited to telephone Mr. Anthony Miologos at 602-313-5683 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

*Naren Thappeta*

Date: March 24, 2005

Narendra Reddy Thappeta  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration Number: 41,416